Page 1 of 2

Case 2:05-cv-01217-JS-MLO

Document 78

Filed 04/28/2006

1350 BROADWAY SUITE 1212 NEW YORK, NY 10018 212-752-9500 FAX 212-752-9506

THE DIAMOND BUILDING

88I ALLWOOD ROAD CLIFTON NJ 07012 973-471-4010 FAX 973-47I-4646

COLEMAN LAW FIRM A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

RONALD D. COLEMAN DAVID STEIN (ALSO ADMITTED IN PAIL AND DC)

PETER S. FRIEDMAN DAVID MARC NEPORENT (ADMITTED IN NU ONLY)

JANE COLEMAN - OF COUNSEL LAWRENCE HERSH - OF COUNSEL (ALSO ADMITTED IN C.A.IL AND REGISTERED TO PRACTICE BEFORE THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE)

WWW.COLEMAN-FIRM.COM

April 27, 2006

VIA ELECTRONIC FILING

Hon. Michael L. Orenstein, U.S.M.J. **United States District Court Eastern District of New York** Long Island Courthouse 100 Federal Plaza Central Islip, NY 11722-4438

Re:

S&L Vitamins v. Australian Gold 05-CV-1217 (JS) (MLO)

5/9/06
Letter matern dated
4/25/06 is deemed
inthtrains.
So Ordered
an Gold

Dear Magistrate Judge Orenstein:

We represent S & L Vitamins and Larry Sagarin in the above-captioned matter. We write in regard to our April 25, 2006, letter to the Court in which we asserted that Australian Gold had not provided us with a list of "premier salons" and a signed Sheehan "premier salon" agreement.

We wish to inform the Court that counsel for Australian Gold has furnished both of these items to us. Via fax yesterday evening and email and overnight mail today, counsel provided us with the list of "premier salons." Counsel for Australian Gold represents that he emailed us the list of "premier salons" on April 19 after we had requested the same on April 17. Neither I nor my partner, David Stein, ever received the email, but we do not question counsel's representation on the matter. Moreover, counsel represents that the Sheehan agreement was sent to us via regular mail this past Monday (April 24), and the agreement also was emailed to us yesterday.

Notwithstanding defendant's compliance with the Court's order as described herein, we continue to view the "premier salon" non sequitur, which was not raised in Australian Gold's pleadings, as an example of Australian Gold's use of litigation as a form of unfair competition.

We thank the Court for its attention to this matter and remain available at the Court's convenience should the Court have any questions.

Case 2:05-cv-01217-JS-MLO Document 79 Filed 05/09/2006 Page 2 of 2

Case 2:05-cv-01217-JS-MLO Document 78 Filed 04/28/2006 Page 2 of 2

Hon. Michael L. Orenstein, U.S.M.J. April 27, 2006 Page 2 of 2

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald D. Coleman

cc: Francis J. Earley, Esquire (via ECF) Scott D. Matthews, Esquire (via ECF)